OPINION 2270 (Case 3440)

Atrichornis Stejneger, 1885 (Aves, ATRICHORNITHIDAE): generic name conserved

Abstract. The Commission has conserved the current usage of the widely used generic name *Atrichornis* Stejneger, 1885, which has been in universal use as a valid generic name for almost 90 years, for the Australian scrub-birds (ATRICHORNITHIDAE), by suppression of the name *Atricha* Gould, 1844, which was used in the incorrect subsequent spelling *Atrichia* for the scrub-birds into the first decade or so of the 20th century.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; ATRICHORNITHIDAE; *Atrichornis*; *Atricha*; *Atrichia*; *Atrichornis rufescens*; scrub-birds; Australia.

Ruling

(1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the generic name *Atricha* Gould, [January] 1844 is suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.
(2) The name *Atrichornis* Stejneger, 1885 (gender: masculine), type species by monotypy *Atrichia rufescens* Ramsay, 1866, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
(3) The name *rufescens* Ramsay, 1866, as published in the binomen *Atrichia rufescens* (specific name of the type species of *Atrichornis* Stejneger, 1885), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.
(4) The name *Atricha* Gould, [January] 1844, as suppressed in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

History of Case 3440

An application to conserve the generic name *Atrichornis* Stejneger, 1885, which has been in universal use as a valid generic name for almost 90 years for the Australian scrub-birds (ATRICHORNITHIDAE), by suppression under Article 23.9.3 of the name *Atricha* Gould, 1844, which was used in the incorrect subsequent spelling *Atrichia* for the scrub-birds into the first decade or so of the 20th century, was received from Richard Schodde (*Australian Biological Resources Study, Canberra, Australia*) and Walter J. Bock (*Columbia University, New York, NY, U.S.A.*) on 19 April 2007. After correspondence the case was published in BZN **65**: 42–45 (March 2008). The title, abstract and keywords of the case were published on the Commission's website. No comments were received on this case.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 2009 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN **65**: 44. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2009 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 18: Bogutskaya, Bouchet, Brothers, Fautin, Grygier, Halliday, Kottelat, Krell, Lamas, Minelli, Ng, Pape, Papp, Patterson, Rosenberg, Štys, van Tol and Zhang.

Negative votes – 3: Alonso-Zarazaga, Kullander and Lim.

Pyle was on leave of absence.

Alonso-Zarazaga, voting AGAINST, said he considered the application to start from a faulty point: that *The Athenaeum* was a published work in the sense of the Code, because it failed to comply with the requirements of Article 8.1.1: it must be issued for the purpose of providing a public and permanent scientific record. *The Athenaeum* was a newspaper and did not have this as its main purpose. The Oxford Universal Dictionary Illustrated defines newspaper as 'a printed, now usually daily or weekly, publication containing news, advertisements, literary matter, and other items of public interest'. Nothing indicated that newspapers were published for scientific record of any kind, which was common sense. If the Commission failed to recognise this, anything printed would become 'scientific record' and there were thousands of newspapers in all world languages. Many of these might carry names and descriptions in advance of their publication in scientific ('academic') journals or books, especially in the case of 'flagship' or charismatic animals, like dinosaurs.' Ng, voting FOR, agreed that the genus name in question for the scrub-birds was worthy of conservation. Changing the status quo helped no one in these circumstances and might affect conservation regimes and research.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Atrichornis Stejneger, 1885, Order XVIII. Passeres. Pp. 458–547 *in* Kingsley, J.S. (Ed.), *The Standard Natural History*, vol. 4, p. 462.

rufescens, *Atrichia*, Ramsay, 1866, *The Clarence and Richmond Examiner*, vol. 7, n. 362, p. 2, col. 4.

Atricha Gould, [January] 1844, *The Athenaeum*, **848**: 90.